



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,960	07/18/2003	Ralph D. Geater	GEAT100USA	4002

24339 7590 11/29/2004

JOEL D. SKINNER, JR.
SKINNER AND ASSOCIATES
212 COMMERCIAL ST.
HUDSON, WI 54016

EXAMINER

SZUMNY, JONATHON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3632	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,960	GEATER, RALPH D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jon A Szumny	3632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8, 11-15, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8, 11-15, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This is the second office action for application number 10/622,960, Fastener Technology, filed on July 18, 2003.

Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the third to last line, "sharp" should be --a sharp--.

Appropriate correction is required.


Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 11-15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 2,340,713 to Tinnerman.



Tinnerman '713 discloses a unitary device (above) comprising a rectilinear frame (above), a planar leg (13) communicatively connected to the frame at the first end and on a first side of the frame, and a first end of a curvilinear arm (above) connected to the frame and defining a cylindrical passage (above) with open ends, wherein the frame has first and second ends (above) and a predetermined length, wherein the leg has a predetermined configuration with a predetermined area and depends from the first end of the frame at a right angle thereto, wherein the device includes connecting means/screw (B), wherein an aperture (14) is disposed at a predetermined location in the leg at a central area thereof, wherein the device could inherently attach to a wall stud, wherein the arm pivotally depends from the second end and second side of the frame, wherein the arm is flexible (column 1, line 49, "spring"), wherein the device can be/is inherently separated a predetermined distance from an external base object., wherein a lock member (above) is connected to the frame on a second side (above) thereof, wherein the second end of the arm has a locking end which releasably mates with the lock member to open and close the passage, wherein the lock member and locking end have complementary mating notches (above), wherein the cylindrical passage is oriented parallel with the plane of the leg, wherein the passage could inherently be *adapted to be* disposed any number of various distances away from a stud, including approximately 1 5/8 inches.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3632

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tinnerman '713 in view of Wollar '281.

Tinnerman '713 teaches the previous invention failing to specifically teach the unitary material of the device to be plastic. However, Wollar '281 teaches a device including a frame, leg and arm that is comprised of plastic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the device of Tinnerman '713 of plastic as in Wollar '281 since it is well known in the art that doing so provides for a low cost, lightweight and sturdy device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 16, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-15, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kenyon '460 and Vallinotto et al. '331 teach various fastener systems for fastening elongated objects to mounting surfaces.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 3632

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon A Szumny whose telephone number is (703) 306-3403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application and proceeding are assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jon Szumny', with a stylized, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Jon Szumny
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3600
Art Unit 3632
November 23, 2004